UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/561,380	08/28/2006	Todd Garrett Simpson	037652.00050	6475

22862 7590 12/09/2009

GLENN PATENT GROUP
3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L
MENLO PARK, CA 94025

EXAMINER	
WRIGHT, BRYAN F	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2431	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/09/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

eptomatters@glenn-law.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/561,380	SIMPSON, TODD GARRETT	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BRYAN WRIGHT	2431	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 July 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,14,17-21 and 24-26* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,14,17-21 and 24-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *3/26/2009*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

FINAL ACTION

1. This action is in response to amendment filed 7/16/2009. Claims 1 and 18 are amended. Claims 4-13, 15, 16, 22 and 23 are cancelled. Claims 1-3, 14, 17-21, and 24-26 are pending

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 14, 17-21, and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rouse et al. (US Patent No. 6,983,310 and Rouse hereinafter) in view of Bradford et al. (US Patent Publication No. 2006/0247915 and Bradford hereinafter) and further in view of Narusawa (US Patent No. 6,823,183).

3. As to claim 1, Rouse teaches a information identification system, comprising:

a first information-search software module which includes executable instructions to identify a first set of information corresponding to a first one of the identified valid actions (e.g., entered character string) (i.e., ...teaches a searching

function provided through executable software loaded on a mobile device [col. 10, lines 25-40]);

a second information-search software module (e.g., calendar module) which includes executable instructions to identify a second set of information corresponding (e.g., viewing option) to a second one of the identified valid actions (col.. 10, lines 53- 65);

and a user interface, capable of providing the sets of information to the user such that the first set of information is more easily accessed by the user than the second set of information (310, fig. 3).

Rouse does not teach:

a platform-framework software module which includes executable instructions to receive input from a user;

a data-type software module which includes executable instructions to identify types of data that might be returned to the user,

a service-descriptor software module which includes executable instructions to identify valid actions corresponding to each identified type of data,

a duplicate-identifier software module, which includes executable instructions to identify duplicate information, the duplicate information being information that appears in the first set of information and the second set of information, wherein the duplicate-identifier software module includes executable instructions to remove the duplicate information from the second set of information;

However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Rouse as introduced by Bradford. Bradford discloses:

a platform-framework software module which includes executable instructions to receive input from a user (to provide a device having a display and user information input mechanism (par. 28));

a data-type software module which includes executable instructions to identify types of data that might be returned to the user (to provide a menu containment of possible user selectable elements (par. 40));

a service-descriptor software module which includes executable instructions to identify valid actions corresponding to each identified type of data, (to provide executable software means for identifying a user action corresponding to a selectable menu elements (par. 41));

a duplicate-identifier software module, which includes executable instructions to identify duplicate information, the duplicate information being information that appears in the first set of information and the second set of information, wherein the duplicate-identifier software module includes executable instructions to remove the duplicate information from the second set of information (to provide duplicate suppression capability [par. 146]);

Therefore, given the teachings of Bradford, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and

advantage of modifying Rouse by employing the well known features of predictive word and user action as disclosed above by Bradford, for which predictable word input will be enhanced [par. 40].

The combination of Rouse and Bradford do not expressly teach:

the types of data including phone number, universal resource locators, names of human beings, names of locations and addresses based on input from the user;

the valid actions including searching a database of phone number, searching a database universal resource locators, searching a database names of human beings, names of locations and addresses;

However at the time of applicant's original filing the ability to search specific data types in a wireless phone environment was well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the combination of Rouse and Bradford as introduced by Narusawa. Narusawa discloses:

the types of data including phone number, universal resource locators, names of human beings, names of locations and addresses based on input from the user (to provide a searching function of various data types (e.g., names, phone numbers) [fig. 4]);

the valid actions including searching a database of phone number, searching a database universal resource locators, searching a database names

of human beings, names of locations and addresses (to provide searching capability [col. 5, lines 60-67; col. 6, lines 1-10]);.

Therefore given the present teachings of both Rouse and Bradford to provide predictive user action capability in a wireless phone environment, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying the teachings of both Rouse and Bradford to enhance the user action prediction process by employing the well known feature of various data type searching as disclosed above by Narusawa.

4. As to claim 2, although the teaching of Rouse illustrates substantial features of the claim invention, however the teachings of Rouse does not discloses:

A system further comprising a platform-aware software module which includes executable instructions to identify an environment in which the user is providing input.

However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Rouse as introduced by Bradford. Bradford discloses:

A system further comprising a platform-aware software module which includes executable instructions to identify an environment in which the user is

providing input (to provide the capability to identify the setting mode of an user environment [par. 44]).

Therefore, given the teachings of Bradford, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying Rouse by employing the well known features of identifying a user environment setting mode as disclosed above by Bradford, for which predictable word input will be enhanced [par. 44].

5. As to claim 3, Rouse teaches a system where the data-type software module includes executable instructions to select the types of data based on the environment (e.g., calendar module) [col. 10, lines 53-60].

6. Claims 4-13, (cancelled)

7. As to claim 14, although the teaching of Rouse illustrates substantial features of the claim invention, however the teachings of Rouse does not discloses:

A system where the executable instructions of the first information search software module include instructions to parse a database of information from which the first set of information is identified. However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Rouse as introduced by Bradford. Bradford discloses:

A system where the executable instructions of the first information search software module include instructions to parse a database of information from which the first set of information is identified (to provide database checking (e.g., parsing) for a first set of information identified [par. 72]).

Therefore, given the teachings of Bradford, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying Rouse by employing the well known features of database parsing as disclosed above by Bradford, for which predictable word input will be enhanced [par. 72].

8. Claims 15 and 16, (cancelled)

9. As to claim 17, although the teaching of Rouse discloses substantial features of the claim invention, however the teachings of Rouse does not disclose: A learning software module, which includes executable instructions to track preferences of the user and determine from the preferences whether the sets of information should be provided to the user such that the second set of information is more easily accessed by the user than the first set of information.

However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Rouse as introduced by Bradford. Bradford discloses:

A learning software module, which includes executable instructions to track preferences of the user and determine from the preferences whether the sets of information should be provided to the user such that the second set of information is more easily accessed by the user than the first set of information (to provide learning capability for user preference [par. 40; par. 43]).

Therefore, given the teachings of Bradford, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying Rouse by employing the well known features of learning a user action for purpose of predictive correlation as disclosed above by Bradford, for which predictable word input will be enhanced [par. 40; par. 43].

10. As to claim 18, Rouse teaches a method of identifying information, comprising:

identify a first set of information corresponding to a first one of the identified valid actions (e.g., entered character string) (i.e., ...teaches a searching function through executable software loaded on a mobile device [col. 10, lines 25-40]);

identify a second set of information corresponding (e.g., viewing option) to a second one of the identified valid actions (col.. 10, lines 53-65);

providing the sets of information to the user such that the first set of information is more easily accessed by the user than the second set of information (310, fig. 3).

Rouse does not teach:

receive input from a user; identify types of data that might be returned to the user;

identify valid actions corresponding to each type of data identified,

identifying duplicate information, the duplicate information being information that appears in the first set of information and the second set of information:

removing the duplicate information from the second set of information,

However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Rouse as introduced by Bradford. Bradford discloses:

to receive input from a user (to provide a device having a display and user information input mechanism (par. 28));

identify types of data that might be returned to the user (to provide a menu containment structure for possible user selectable elements (par. 40)),

identify valid actions corresponding to each type of data identified, (to provide executable software means for identifying a user action corresponding to a selectable menu elements (par. 41));

identifying duplicate information, the duplicate information being information that appears in the first set of information and the second set of information, removing the duplicate information from the second set of

information (to provide duplicate information recognition and suppression (e.g., removal) capability [par. 146]);

Therefore, given the teachings of Bradford, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying Rouse by employing the well known features of predictive word and user action as disclosed above by Bradford, for which predictable word input will be enhanced [par. 40].

The combination of Rouse and Bradford do not expressly teach:

the types of data including phone number, universal resource locators, names of human beings, names of locations and addresses based on input from the user;

the valid actions including searching a database of phone number, searching a database universal resource locators, searching a database names of human beings, names of locations and addresses;

However at the time of applicant's original filing, the ability to search specific data types in a wireless phone environment was well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the combination of Rouse and Bradford as introduced by Narusawa. Narusawa discloses:

the types of data including phone number, universal resource locators, names of human beings, names of locations and addresses based on input from

the user (to provide a searching function of various data types (e.g., names, phone numbers) [fig. 4]);

the valid actions including searching a database of phone number, searching a database universal resource locators, searching a database names of human beings, names of locations and addresses (to provide searching capability [col. 5, lines 60-67; col. 6, lines 1-10]);.

Therefore given the present teachings of both Rouse and Bradford to provide predictive user action capability in a wireless phone environment, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying the teachings of both Rouse and Bradford to enhance the user action prediction process by employing the well known feature of various data type searching as disclosed above by Narusawa.

11. As to claim 19, although the teaching of Rouse illustrates substantial features of the claim invention, however the teachings of Rouse does not discloses: A method further comprising identifying an environment in which the user is providing input. However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Rouse as introduced by Bradford. Bradford discloses:

A method further comprising identifying an environment in which the user is providing input (to provide the capability to identify the setting mode of a user environment [par. 44]).

Therefore, given the teachings of Bradford, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying Rouse by employing the well known features of identifying a user environment setting mode as disclosed above by Bradford, for which predictable word input will be enhanced [par. 44].

12. As to claim 20, Rouse teaches further comprising identifying an environment and selecting types of data based on the environment (col. 10, lines 53-65).

13. As to claim 21, although the teaching of Rouse illustrates substantial features of the claim invention, however the teachings of Rouse does not discloses:

A method further comprising parsing a database of information from which the first set of information is identified. However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Rouse as introduced by Bradford. Bradford discloses: A method further comprising parsing a database of information from which the first set of information is identified (to provide database checking (e.g., parsing) for a first set of information identified [par. 72]).

Therefore, given the teachings of Bradford, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying Rouse by employing the well known features of database parsing as disclosed above by Bradford, for which predictable word input will be enhanced [par. 72].

14. Claims 22 and 23, (cancelled).

15. As to claims 24-26, although the teaching of Rouse discloses substantial features of the claim invention, however the teaching or Rouse does not disclose:

A method further comprising tracking preferences of the user and determining from the preferences whether the sets of information should be provided to the user such that the second set of information is more easily accessed by the user than the first set of information (claim 24).

A method where tracking preferences is accomplished by tracking the frequency with which the user selects information from the sets (claim 25).

A method where tracking preferences is accomplished by tracking the recently selected information from the sets (claim 26).

However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Rouse as introduced by Bradford. Bradford discloses:

A method further comprising tracking preferences of the user and determining from the preferences whether the sets of information should be provided to the user such that the second set of information is more easily accessed by the user than the first set of information (to provide user preference tracking capability [par. 43]) (claim 24).

A method where tracking preferences is accomplished by tracking the frequency with which the user selects information from the sets (to provide user input tracking capability [par. 40]) (claim 25).

A method where tracking preferences is accomplished by tracking the recently selected information from the sets (to provide the capability to track previous entries action performed by a user [par. 40]) (claim 26).

Therefore, given the teachings of Bradford, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying Rouse by employing the well known features of user action tracking as disclosed above by Bradford, for which predictable word input will be enhanced [par. 40].

Prior Art Made of Record

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. Kwon et al. (US Patent No. 7,515,941).

.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 14, 17-21, and 24-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRYAN WRIGHT whose telephone number is

(571)270-3826. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5:30 pm Monday -Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Korzuch can be reached on (571) 272-7589. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/BRYAN WRIGHT/
Examiner, Art Unit 2431

/William R. Korzuch/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2431